

A STUDY ON EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION VIEWED FROM CONVERSATION ANALYSIS PERSPECTIVES

Eka Surya Buana
ekachic24@gmail.com

Haryanto
haryanto@unm.ac.id

Kisman Salija
kismansalija@unm.aac.id

ABSTRACT

Eka Surya Buana. 2018. *A study on EFL classroom interaction viewed from conversation analysis perspective*. (Supervised by Haryanto and Kisman Salija)

The purpose of the study was to investigate the types and the function of classroom interaction features that occurred in the EFL classroom interaction. This research employed descriptive qualitative research. It applied purposive random sampling technique in selecting sample. The participants of this research were three lecturers and a class of English students at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. The data were collected by employing video recording and interview. The obtained data was scripted and analyzed based on three major phases, namely data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The result of this research showed that; the types of classroom interaction features occurred in the EFL classroom interaction are turn taking (taking the turn, holding the turn and yielding the turn), sequence organization (adjacency pair, insertion sequence, and pre-sequence), and repair (other initiated repair, other repair, self-initiated repair and self-repair). Furthermore, those types of interactional features serve a certain function such as to take the ignored yielding, giving correction, giving comments or answer, as a signal to move to the next topic, to seek for attention, to plan or prepare what to say, to give time to think during talk, make a new start in talking to checking students understanding, asking questions, and inviting students to speak or to do something, and to correct talk.

Keywords: *EFL classroom interaction, interactional features, conversation analysis.*

INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction is considered as one of the most essential feature in teaching English as foreign language. Tuan & Nhu (2010) state that classroom interaction is a key in order to reach the main aim of learning language. In line with Haradasht & Aidinlou (2016), they mention that the fulfillment of teaching depends mostly on the teacher-student interaction within the actual classroom. The importance of understanding classroom events

and the role of this understanding in the achievement of desired language goals is vital in language learning literature. As Hall & Walsh (2002) claim that, it is in the interaction that the teacher and the students work together to create the intellectual and practical activities that shape both the form and content of the target language. Therefore, it is crucial to investigate the interaction that might happen in language classroom especially the EFL classroom.

To this end, a number of approaches have been proposed to investigate the interactional features in classroom interaction. Walsh (2006) identifies three major areas of investigation: interaction analysis, discourse analysis and conversation analysis. The present study will try to analyze EFL classroom interaction from conversation analysis perspectives as it has the potential to play a key role in language teaching and it provides a “one of a kind” look into what makes classroom interaction happen. Conversation analysis (CA) is an empirical approach to the analysis of oral interaction whose purpose is to discover systematic features present in the sequential organization of talk (Lazaraton, 2004). Furthermore, CA is concerned with identifying these features and understanding how they are used in action.

In this case, CA will give EFL teachers view to interactional features that are essential to the classroom interaction, like turn taking, sequence organization and repair. A CA outlook on classroom interaction can help language teachers reach a kind of heightened awareness and understanding of classroom interaction. Thus, the present study will focused its attention on teacher-student-students interaction in an Indonesian university context. The rationale underlying the study is that an understanding of the dynamics of classroom interaction is essential for teachers to establish and maintain good communicative practice and the first step in gaining such an understanding is familiarization with features of classroom interaction. Therefore, it is crucial and urgent to explore deeper the interactional feature in EFL classroom interaction. Thus, the main aim of this study is to examine, from a CA perspective the organization of turn taking, repair and sequence organization occurred in EFL classroom teacher-student interactions. In light of the above, this study addresses the following research questions::

1. What are the types of classroom interaction features occurred in EFL classroom interaction at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo?
2. What are the functions of classroom interaction features occurred in EFL classroom interaction at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo?

RESEARCH METHOD

This study was descriptive qualitative. The participants of this research are the students in the fourth semester in English study program of Cokroaminoto University of Palopo in academic year 2017/2018. The samples of the research are one class. It is class A with the total samples are 30 students. The primary instrument of this study would be the researcher herself. The secondary instrument applied was video recording and interview questions. In collecting the data, the researcher applied direct observation while monitoring the interaction happen in EFL classroom in teaching and learning process. Then, the researcher also used camera recording to record the classroom interaction. After that, the researcher interview the students and the lecturer regarding the function of the interactional features occurred during teaching and learning process. Thus, in analyzing the data from the observation the researcher used some steps, namely data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification.

FINDINGS

After collecting and analyzing the data about interactional features that appeared in the EFL classroom interaction whether in interaction between the lecturers and the students or the interaction among students of Cokroaminoto University Palopo, the researcher shows the findings of the data in each session in order to answer the research question as follows.

1. The types of interactional features that occurred in EFL classroom interaction at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo

The first finding of this study was begun by the researcher's reports after identifying the interactional features occurred in EFL classroom interaction. It was found that there are some classroom interaction features occurred in both lecturers-students interaction and among students interaction. Those interactional features including; turn taking (taking the turn, holding the turn and yielding the turn); sequence organization (adjacency pair, insertion sequence and pre-sequence); and repair (other initiated repair, other repair, self-initiated repair, and self-repair). They are explained as follows:

Turn Taking

The first interactional features that the researcher found is turn taking that occurred throughout the whole interactions process in both lecturers-student interaction and students-students interaction. In this case there are some forms of turn taking happens in the interaction process, they are taking the turn, holding the turn and yielding the turn. Those types of taking the turn presented as follows

a. Taking the turn

Lecturers-Students Interaction

Extract 1 The lectures take over the conversation

L	: Have you found?
S1	: ee some of us have found it
L	: <i>But I don't see there is a laptop in my table, on my table. When I ask you maybe, when I ask you to prepare to play the video, maybe I ask you to copy in one laptop maybe. So you didn't do it right?</i>
S	: (silent)
L	: <i>Key? Oke! Now, when you have to talking about the strategy first, strategy in learning. When you want to teach the students you have to know what is the strategy is to what, will you use, yah, and after that you talking about the method, strategv.</i>

Another example of taking the turn can be seen in extract 1. It showed how the lecturer takes over the conversation by saying “***But I don't see there is a laptop in my table, on my table***”. The word *but* at the beginning of the utterance showed the use of taking over in form of links, where the lecturer takes the turn by using connecting word. It is shows that the lecturers directly respond to what the students said before and point out that what the students said is questionable. Then, the lecture yield the turn to students by asking “***So you didn't do it right?***”, however the students ignore it, so the lecture take over the turn again by making uptake “***key? Oke!***”

Among Students Interaction

Extract 2: The students begin the group discussion

The students were divided into several group and asked to discuss about the materials. One student initiate to open the discussion.

S1	: ee ee, oke, siapa yang mau menyampaikan opininya pertama? “ee, okay, who wants to convey their opinion first?”
S2	: saya mi duluan nah, ee, penilaian dalam kalimat itu ada ada empat point.. yang dinilai dalam yang pertama itu.. ada content atau idea maksudnya inti.. ee inti dari kalimatnya, yang kedua itu ada vocabulary atau kata-katanya,,,

Based on the extract 2 above, it can be seen that the students initiate to begin the group discussion even with a hesitant start. He started the discussion by saying “*ee, oke, siapa yang mau menyampaikan opininya pertama?*”. It indicates that starting to talk can be a difficult thing, and that makes the speaker use a filled pauses. In this case the students use filled pauses *ee* to give him a little bit time to prepare what she is going to say next.

b. Holding the turn

Lecturers-Students Interaction

The types of holding the turn found in the lecturers and students interaction presented in the following extracts:

Extract 3: The students used filled pauses in speaking

S1	: <i>ehm, ee you ask us to find a video,,</i>
L	: <i>Video?</i>
S1	: <i>Like ee related to ee teaching</i>

Extract 3 above shows the use of filled pauses by the students when he is talking with the lecturer. It is shows when she said “*ehm, ee you ask us to find a video*”. She use filled pauses *ee* as a strategy to hold the turn, however after the word video she makes a silent pauses that makes the lecturer take over the turn by saying “*video?*” as he curious about what kind of video the students means. The students then, take the turn stating “*Like ee related to ee teaching*” to respond the lecturer statement, still with the use of filled pauses *ee*.

Among Students Interaction

The types of holding the turn in form of filled pauses found among the students interaction presented in the following extracts:

Extract 4: The students explain the material to the other students

S1	: <i>okey next</i>
S5	: <i>jenis test selanjutny.. dimana pembaca.. harus melengkapi kalimat dengan.. kata yang dihapus tapi ee tersedia ji secara acak. Kayak begini e</i>

Extract 4 above present interaction that happen among the students in a group discussion. It shows that the students take turn to convey their material. In conveying this material, it can be seen that the students use silent pauses to hold their turn.

c. Yielding the turn

Lecturers-Students Interaction

The types of taking the turn in form of starting up found in the lecturers and students interaction presented in the following extracts:

Extract 5: The lecturer yielding the turn by doing appealing

<i>L</i>	<i>: Tidak. Inilah bagi orang orang yang suka ikut ikut bilang samaji jawabanku, ternyata kalau gambar beda. Berarti pikiran kita masing masing memiliki ide dan gagasan boleh mirip tapi tidak mungkin sama. Yakan?</i>
<i>SS</i>	<i>: Yes sir</i>

Extract 5 above shows how the lecture employ appealing in yielding the turn. It can be seen that at the end of his talk he use questions tag “*yakan?*” (*right?*) which require the other speaker ti make some kind of feedback. In this case the lecturer wants to know whether the students agree with what he explained before.

Among Students Interaction

The types of holding the turn in form of filled pauses found among the students interaction presented in the following extracts:

Extract 6: The lecture give up in his talk

<i>L</i>	<i>: yah ternyata pintar-pintar semua. Apa lagi? No more? Tidak ada lagi?. Coba kamu buat satu contoh yang rearrange dan completion. Okay. Buat masing-masing satu contoh yang rearrange sama apa tadi? Eemm eee....</i>
<i>SS</i>	<i>: completion.</i>

Extract 6 shows how the lecturer give up in his talk. It can be seen that in the end of the lecturer talk he use a filled pauses and then make a log pauses. This long pauses was noticed by the students, and that make them take over the turn.

Sequence Organization

The second interactional features that the researcher found is sequence organization in both lecturers-student interaction and students-students interaction. In this case there are some forms of sequence orgnaization happens in the interaction process, they are adjacency pair, insertion sequence and pre-sequence. Those types of sequence organization presented as follows:

a. Adjacency pair

Lecturers-Students Interaction

The forms of adjacency pair found in the lecturers and students interaction presented in the following extracts:

Extract 7: Blame-Admission

L	: <i>Hah? Habis, karena tidak diantisipasi. Iya kan?</i>
S	: <i>(Silent)</i>
L	: <i>Saya tadi kesana masih ada disana.</i>
S	: <i>Sorry sir</i>

Extract 7 above shows that the lecturer blame the student about that they didn't get an LCD because the students did not anticipate it by saying "***Hah? Habis, karena tidak diantisipasi. Iya kan? ?***" and such expressions is categorized as blaming. Upon hearing the lecturers statement, the student just silent so the lecturer said again "***Saya tadi kesana masih ada disana*** " and responded by the students with "***Sorry sir***". This indicate that he feel sorry and admit that he is wrong because he did not check the LCD earlier.

Among Students Interaction

The forms of adjacency pair found among students interaction presented in the following extract:

Extract 8: Questions Answer

S1	: <i>jadi pake grammar juga terus vocab yah? Sama ji kayak punyaku?</i>
S4	: <i>iya samaji kayaknya grammar sama vocab juga.</i>

Extract 8 above shows the use of questioning by the students "***jadi pake grammar juga terus vocab yah? Sama ji kayak punyaku?***". (so it also use grammar and vocabulary? Just like mine?) the questions shows that the first student wants to confirm the other students opinion. As she need certain answer, she then ask directly using questions. When the second speaker took her turn to talk, she answers "***iya samaji kayaknya grammar sama vocab juga..***" From the students answer it can be seen that she have the same opinion with the former speaker.

b. Insertion Sequence

Extract 9: Questions-Offer-Acceptance-Answer

L	: <i>ada lagi? Just say what in your mind. Ada lagi? Tidak ada?. Okay, Do you have any boardmarker?</i>
S	: <i>dihapus dulu bu?</i>
L	: <i>dihapus-hapus dulu itu papan tulisnya</i>
S	: <i>ada ji penghapus buk.</i>

Extract 9 above presented an example of another insertion sequence. It can be seen that the lecturer asked questions by saying “*ada lagi? Just say what in your mind. Ada lagi? Tidak ada?. Okay, Do you have any boardmarker?*”. As it is a questions the pair should be answer, but the students did not directly answer it, instead she offer to clean the board by saying “*dihapus dulu bu?*” a Upon hearing this, the lecturer immediately accept the answer by saying “*dihapus-hapus dulu itu papan tulisnya*” and this makes the students answer the former questions produced by the lecturer by saying “*ada ji penghapus buk.*”

c. Pre-sequence

Extract 10 : Pre-Closing

L	: <i>ada lagi?</i>
SS	: <i>no</i>
L	: <i>no? okey. Minggu depan siap siap speaking yah. I think enough for today. Assalamualaikum warahmatullai wabarakatu</i>
AS	: <i>Walaikumsalam warahmatullahi wabarakatuh</i>

Extract 10 presented the pre-sequence in forms of pre-closing that happen in the interaction between the lecturer and the students at the end of the meeting. It can be seen that the lecturer said “*ada lagi?*”. It indicated that the lecturer (L) was checking whether students have something to ask before ending the meeting. Then some students (SS) respond with “*no*”, which indicate that everything is clear. Thus, the lecture proceeds the closing of the meeting by saying “*no? okey. Minggu depan siap siap speaking yah. I think enough for today. Assalamualaikum warahmatullai wabarakatu*”. That statement show that because the students have no more to ask it is time to end the class and he eventually end the meeting by saying Islamic greetings which replied by all students (AS) with the same greeting.

Among students interaction

The types of pre sequence found among the students interaction presented in the following extract:

Extract 11: Summon-aswer

S1	: taufik?
S2	: apa?
S1	: sekelompok

Extract 11 shows the pre-quence in form of summon-answer that appeared in interaction among students. It can be seen that the first students call the name of the second students by saying his name “*taufik?*” in asking questions tone. Thus, it indicate that the first students are seeking attention from the second speaker as he had something to say. Then, it was proven when the second studnets answer with “*apa?*” (*what*), the first students immediately informs that they belong to the same group.

Repair

The third interactional features that the researcher found is repair in both lecturers-student interaction and students-students interaction. In this case there are some forms of repair happens in the interaction process, they are other initiated repair, other repair, self-initiated repair and self-repair. Those types of repair presented as follows:

Lecturers-Students Interaction

The types of taking the turn in form of starting up found in the lecturers and students interaction presented in the following extracts:

1) Extract 12: Other repair

S1	: <i>anu multiply</i>
SS	: <i>multiple choice</i>
L	: <i>multiple choice test</i>
S	: <i>yah itu</i>

The extract 12 displays the use of repair by both students “*multiple choice*” and lecturer “*multiple choice test*”. It is obvious that the some students cut off S1 talk at a point where it multiply was not the right word to say order to repair it. Some students said “*multiple choice*” and the lecturer completed it “*multiple choice test*” as that is the right word, not *multiply* but *multiple*. It can be seen that lecturer and the students use repair in order to fix the problem in talk, in here replacing one word with other word. Thus, such expressions categorized as other initiated repair as the repair initiated by other person not the current speaker.

Extract 13: Other initiated repair

- S10 : okay, yang kami dapat kemarin itu ada lima. Yang pertama itu missing letter, contoh dari missing letter itu ada kata yang hilang terus kita lengkapi*
- L : bukan kata yah*
- S10 : huruf, huruf, nah ada huruf yang hilang terus harus di lengkapi. Kedua itu jumbled letters, kayak gini, nah inikan tidak tersusun dengan bagus terus disusun dengan bagus.*

Extract 13 above presented the use of repair in forms of other initiated repair. As we can see, the student (S10) said “*..contoh dari missing letter itu ada kata yang hilang terus kita lengkapi*” and the lecturer found there something wrong with what the student said, so the lecture take over by saying “*bukan kata yah*”. From the lecturers statement it can be seen that the word *kata* (word) that said by the students is wrong. Responding to the lecturer statement, the students repair his talk by saying “*huruf, huruf, nah ada huruf yang hilang terus harus di lengkapi*”. It is evidence that the word *kata* is wrong and the right word is *huruf*. Thus, the lecturer succeeded in helping the students to repair his talk.

Students-Students Interaction

The types of taking the turn in form of starting up found in the students and students interaction presented in the following extracts:

Extract 14: Self repair

- S6 : emm okay, there are eleven to thirteen numbers of question that have to ee face in the last section. Until completing all this section it means you have already answer the ee. Okay for completeing this test there are fifty questions fifty questions divide into three section. First section around ee. There are twenty questions*
- S7 : twenty?*
- S6 :emm thirty questions. How many questions in this section?*

Extract 14 above presented the use of repair in forms of self-repair perform by the students when interacting with the other students. As we can see, the student (S6) said “*..there are twenty questions*” and S7 doubted what the student said, so she yield the turn by saying “*twenty?*”. From S7 statement it can be seen that *twenty questions* that said by S6 is wrong. Responding to that, S6 repair his talk by saying “*emm thirty questions*”. Thus, S7 succeeded in repairing his own talk with help from S6. It is in line with Levinson (1983) notion that self-repair is a repair that performed by the speaker of utterance who needs repair.

2. The function of interactional features that occurred in EFL classroom interaction at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo

Based on the finding about the types of interactional types used by the lecturers in teaching English, it was found that there are three interactional features that occurred in the interaction process between the lecturers and the students and among the students. Behind the use of those interactional features, there were various function, those function are as follows:

Turn Taking

To start the meeting

The lecturer gave the signal of starting up by greeted the students at the beginning of the class as the first step to get the students to be ready to study. It can be found, as an example in extract 1 where the lecturer open or start the class by using Islamic greeting “*okay, Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh*”. This greeting was given as a clear start that marks the start of the lesson. It was supported by the result of the interview with the lecturer, he stated that “*Nah saya mulai dengan kata oke, sebagai penanda bahwa kelas sudah harus dimulai, ee untuk menarik perhatian siswa dan penanda bahwa kelas sudah dimulai, kemudian baru saya lanjutkan dengan salam (I start with the word oke as sign that the class should be started, to attract the students attention and as a sign that the class has started, I continued with salam)*”.

To take the ignored yielding

In this research, it was found that in several times, the students ignored the yielded turn given by the lecturer. Since the students were silent and do not respond, the lecturer took over the floor using several signals. It was supported by the result of interview with the lecturer, where he stated that “*kadang siswa itu passive dalam kelas, ketika ditanya mereka diam dan tidak merespon apa yang saya ucapkan, ee baik itu dalam bentuk questions atau command. Sehingga otomatis sebagai teacher kita kembali berbicara, baik itu melanjutkan pertanyaan atau move ke topic baru.*”. The statement above shows how the lecturer takes the ignored floor from the students, and continued to talk.

To move to the next topic

Furthermore, it also evidence that turn taking in form of taking the turn serves as a signal to move to the next topic. In this research, it was found that the lecturer often done the taking over by making uptake first, then proceed to say his/her intention. Proves can be seen in the result of interview with the lecturers, where he stated “*Nah ketika akan berbicara itu,*

saya gunakan kata okay, sebagai penanda bahwa saya melanjutkan pembicaraan atau pindah ke topic pelajaran selanjutnya”. From the lecturer statement it can be seen that the lecturer use the word okay as a sign to continue the talk or move to another topic.

To plan or prepare what to say and to give time to think during talk

Both lecturer and students found to employ holding the turn in forms of filled pauses, silent pauses, and lexical repetition to give help them hold the turn and plan what they are going to say. It is proven from the interview with the students, where the students stated *“iye, kan kalau sementara bicara na kulupa apa mau kubilang pasti keluar itu ee ee ku, terus baruka ingat-ingat lagi apa mau kubilang”*. It shows that the students employed filled pause as her attempt to plan what he is going to say next

To check students understanding

During the interaction process between the lecturers and other students, the lecturer seems to use yielding the turn in form of appealing to see whether the students understand about the material or not. It is supported by the result of interview, where the lecturer state *“Saya sering mengatakan mengerti? atau sudah paham? Hampir di setiap penjelasan saya itu, untuk mengecek secara berkala pemahaman siswa mengenai pelajaran yang sedang dibahas”*. It is indicated that the in the lecturer always checking his students understanding, to make sure the students follow the what they learn.

Sequence organization

To build a conversation

Each pair of sequence organization in form of adjacency pair that found in this research serve a different function depending on the pairs. The adjacency pair that appeared in this research are question-answer, offer-acceptance, assessment-disagreement, blame-admission, and request-admission. However, all of those used to build conversation in classroom.

To clarify talk

Insertion sequence used to clarify talk. It can be seen in students statement in the interview where she stated *“kan ndag dimengerti apa namaksud itu ibu, terus banyak juga natanyakan, makanya bingungki, jadi biar jelas toh kak, ditanya lagi, biar ndag salah begitue”*. It indicate that when the students confused with the lecturer questions or command, they take over with another questions to make sure she got what her lectures want her to do.

Repair

To correct mistake in speaking

The function of repair is to correct mistake in speaking. The result of interview with the lecturer clarify the statement above, in the interview, the lecturer said “*Ketika siswa berbicara, dan ada salah kata biasanya saya langsung memperbaiki dengan mengucapkan kata yang benar, atau kadang juga saya pancing, dengan mengulag kata yang salah. Akan tetapi jika siswa salah konsep atau pemahamanm, saya biarkan mereka menyelesaikan pembicaraannya lalu saya perbaiki dengan konsep yang benar, begitupun kalau saya ada salah ucap, saya repair directly*”. From the lecturer statement it supported the previous explanation about the function of repair, as in clearly proved that the lecturer repair the students mistake in talking in form of other repair or other initiated repair, while he repair his mistakes in talk by using self-initiated repair.

DISCUSSIONS

The turn-taking organization in this study was divided into three turn allocations. The first one was the general turn taking which was conducted by the lecturer to give free turn allocations for the students to involve in the classroom interaction. The general turn taking were conducted in term of asking questions and gaining responses from the students in a daily routine activities, such as in asking the day, the date and when the teacher initiates the topic around the students’ feeling, and about what they learned during the day in their classroom.

Example of general turn taking happened when the lecturer also ask questions to the students that required the students to provide answer. In this case there were some students who tended to dominate the turns and these students always actively had something to share. Meanwhile, there were some students who were rather reluctant to respond, they tended to ignore the teacher’s questions. Sometimes, they only responded after the prompts from the teacher. In this case, the teacher expected everyone to involve in the interaction, which was why she conducted the personal turn taking. Here, the teacher wanted to have every student to involve in the conversation. It confirms what Paoletti and Fele (2004) point out that the teacher always engaged to find balance between the control of the classroom activity and the students’ participation. There were some situations where the teacher had to switch from general turn to the personal turn. These happened when the teacher conducted general turn but no one gave a response so she nominated someone to respond by calling out the student name. This situation confirms what Tsui (1995) describes that a common pattern found in classroom where there is no student volunteers to take a turn, the teacher moves to a personal interaction to sustain the interaction. However, if there still no responds, the lecturer decided

to take over the talk. This data confirms Seedhouse (2004) notion that if the current speaker has not selected a next speaker and if no other participant self-selects, then the current speaker may continue.

The second turn allocation was the lecturer's personal turn taking which occurred in some situations as such as: first, when the lecturer talk one in one with a student by giving questions or comments. In this case, the teacher gave responses and feedback to the students' topic and she asked the follow up questions, in result the teacher allocated and allowed the student who brought up the topic some interactional space. Next is when the lecturer find a student became reluctant to share her/his ideas and involve in discussion. In this case, the teacher prompted and encouraged the student to take an active part in discussion by giving questions so the students had turn allocations. It is in accordance to Hall (1997) who argued that the teacher played an important role in distributing learning opportunities by means of constructing different social participation structures with different individual students.

The third turn allocation was the among students turn taking. It was found that interaction between students happened in several occasion, like when they are assigned in a group discussion, they interact with each other by sharing their ideas. it was also happened when on of their friend talk in from of the classroom, they tend to give comment or questions related to the topic that their friends share.

Seedhouse (2004) argues that the sequence organization of second language classroom follows a certain pattern. The teacher introduces the pedagogic focus and the students react to it. The students analyze the situation and how to take action and then the teacher gives feedback or evaluation. This is also what happened in this research, as the sequence organization was analyzed from the beginning activity until the end of every meeting. The lecturers open the class by greeting which replied by the students with greetings also. Then it was continued by the lecturers asked questions to the students about the students feeling and the previous lesson, which replied by the students with answers about their feelings and what they remember about the previous meetings. There was some occasion where the students offer something to the students or command the students to do something. Furthermore, the sequence was generally initiated by the lecturer, however the students sometimes inserted their sequence in which the lecturer allowed this happened because she did not want to stop the students to express themselves. The insertion sequences occurred when the students do not understand the lecturers questions so they insert a new

sequence in form of questions also which the lecturer responded with feedbacks, follow up questions or answer.

Repair is the organization of how people deal with problem in speaking, hearing and understanding in conversation (Schegloff et al, 1977 as cited in Yasui, 2010). Yasui (2010) stated that repair sequence shows how interactional participants accomplish mutual understanding. In lecturer students interaction, it was found that the lecturer use self-repair to correct his talk, and then when the students makes mistakes, the lecturer prompted the students by giving them the correct form and the students up took the repair by repeating the correct form. This data in line with Kasper (1986) findings, that usually the teacher is the one who initiates the repair because usually the teacher is the one who pays attention to the forms used by the students. Most of the repairs were taken by the lecturers and only a few was taken by other students.

Based on the findings and discussions above, the researchers found that the use of all types of the interactional features has strategic value in structuring lessons and in shifting roles and participation patterns between lecturer and students. Although, the exchanges were dominantly teacher-initiated, the students were also given a chance to express their opinion, feeling and personal experience; or were they encouraged to raise questions or to make comments freely. Such interaction highlights how members of the classroom, in this case the teacher, “construct roles and identities by observably orienting to the sequential, turn taking, and repair organization of talk-ininteraction” (Kasper and Markee 2004: 496).

There were some case negotiation of meaning among students interaction in all four meetings but none found during lecturers-student interaction. That is to say, students’ utterances in lecturer-student interaction still address only the teacher rather than their classmates. The teacher is still a central figure who is controlling the interaction and keeps the interaction going. Thus, the fact that organizations of interaction have a reflexive relationship with teaching pedagogical purpose, lecturers should try to work out the suitable organization of interaction that is compatible with the pedagogical focus. Then, organization of classroom interaction is also a very dynamical one and should be adjusted to pedagogical goals.

To sum up, the application of Conversation Analysis to EFL classrooms interaction provide examples for lecturers to improve their teaching practices by investigating actual language use in the classroom and identify the interactional features that occurred in classroom interaction. In order to create a more communicative teaching and learning

environment to foster students' communicative focus, during the classroom interaction, teachers should resist roles of being a central figure of the classroom and try to be co-communicator with students. The lecturer should provide equal opportunities for every student to have a chance to participate during the interaction especially in turn taking as it was proved as the most dominant interactional features that occurred in classroom interaction. The lecturers should allow variability in the sequence organization in teacher-student classroom interaction by giving rights to initiate a topic and sequence so that they can establish power in the interaction. Finally yet importantly, it is a vital part of the lecturer's role to point out the students' errors and speech trouble and provide repairs.

CONCLUSION

After observing the EFL classroom interaction, the result displayed that there are three types of interactional features that appeared in both the interaction between the lecturer and the students and among the students. Those types are turn taking (taking the turn, holding the turn, and yielding the turn), sequence organization (adjacency pair, insertion sequence and pre-sequence) and repair (other initiated repair, other repair, self-initiated repair and self-repair). The existences of those interactional features were employed by the lecturer and the students for a reasons and it serve a certain function. Those interactional features used to start the meeting, to take the ignored yielding, to give correction, comments or answer, as a signal to move to the next topic, to plan or prepare what to say, to give time to think during talk, to checking students understanding, to build conversation, to clarify talk and to correct mistake in speaking. From all the types of interactional features, turn taking is the most dominantly features that appeared both in lecturer-students interaction and among students interaction. In the EFL classroom interaction, it was found that the lecturer used taking the turn in forms of prompting and appealing the most, while the students used taking the turn in forms of uptake the most.

REFERENCES

- Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 186.

- Haradasht, M. A., & Aidinlou, N. A. (2016). A case study on EFL classroom discourse. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS)* ISSN 2356-5926, 1(1), 1762–1770.
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 171–212. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000014>
- Lazaraton, A. (2004). Gesture and speech in the vocabulary explanations of one ESL teacher: A microanalytic inquiry. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 79–117.
- Macbeth, D. (2004). The relevance of repair for classroom correction. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 703–736.
- Malamah, & Thomas. (1991). *Classroom interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nakamura, I. (2008). Understanding how teacher and student talk with each other: An exploration of how repair displays the co-management of talk-in-interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 265–283.
- Rahman, A. Q. (2006). *Turn-Taking Mechanisms and Pragmatics in English Conversations*. Makassar: UNM Publishers.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis (Vol. 1)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2011). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Skuse, G. (2012). *A Conversation Analysis Approach to Interaction within an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Class Information Gap Task*.
- Tuan, L. T., & Nhu, N. T. K. (2010). Theoretical review on oral interaction in EFL classrooms. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1(4), 29.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge.